



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/473,554	12/29/1999	KENNETH MCCLAMROCH	RSW9-99-119	1113
7590	12/02/2004		EXAMINER	
MARK D SIMPSON SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP 2600 ARAMARK TOWER 1101 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 191072950			NGUYEN, CINDY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/473,554	MCCLAMROCH ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Cindy Nguyen	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/14/04.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 16 August 2002 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to request for communication filed 05/14/04.

1. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zgarba et al. (US20020170048) (Zgarba) in view of Greenfeld (US 4931928).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Zgarba discloses: A computer-implemented method for indexing and locating assets stored on a storage device, comprising the steps of:

performing a crawl process on said storage device to identify stored assets (page 4, 0052, Zgarba);

identifying asset-specific parameters¹ related to said stored assets (page 4, 0052, Zgarba);

analyzing said stored assets based on said identified asset-specific parameters (page 4, 0053, Zgarba);

extracting textual, semantic information from said stored assets (page 4, 0051, Zgarba).

However, Zgarba didn't disclose: storing and indexing² said extracted textual and semantic information for retrieval parameters. On the other hand, Greenfeld discloses: storing and indexing said extracted textual and semantic information for retrieval parameters (col. 7,

¹ Examiner interpreted asset-specific parameter as different classes, variables, structures as struct and union.

lines 27-35, Greenfeld). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include step for storing and indexing said extract textual and semantic information for retrieval parameters in the system of Zgarba as taught Greenfeld. The motivation being to enable the analyzer locates semantic information to be extracted and modification of desired parts of the source code fast.

Regarding claim 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Zgarba/Greenfeld discloses: wherein said stored assets comprise assets of diverse types (page 2, 0035, Zgarba), and wherein said identifying step identifies the asset type of each stored asset (page 2, 0026, Zgarba).

² Indexing as locating the source code in file as the line number and column number.

Regarding claim 3, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 2. In addition, Zgarba/Greenfeld discloses: wherein said extracting step includes the extraction of semantic information specific to the asset type of each stored asset (col. 5, lines 30-44, Greenfeld).

Regarding claim 8, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 7. In addition, Zgarba/Greenfeld discloses: locating means for locating stored assets by applying a search query to said semantic information stored in said storing and indexing means (page 5, 0066, Zgarba).

Regarding claim 9, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8. In addition, Zgarba/Greenfeld discloses: wherein said locating means includes means for applying a search query to said textual information stored in said storing and indexing means" (page 5, 0066, Zgarba).

Regarding claim 10, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9. In addition, Zgarba/Greenfeld discloses: wherein said locating means includes means for applying a search query to both said semantic information and said textual information simultaneously (page 5, 0067, Zgarba).

Regarding claim 11, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 2 and 7. In addition, Zgarba/Greenfeld discloses: wherein said analyzing means

comprises an analysis server (48, fig. 3, Greenfeld connected between said crawling means (40, fig. 3, Greenfeld, and said storing and indexing means said analysis server including one or more asset-type specific servers, with at least one of said asset types having a corresponding asset-type specific analyzer (col. 7, lines 35-53, Greenfeld).

Regarding claim 12, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. In addition, Zgarba/Greenfeld discloses: wherein a plurality of said asset types have a corresponding asset-type specific analyzer (col. 8, lines 39-53, Greenfeld).

Regarding claim 13, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 12. In addition, Zgarba discloses: wherein each of said asset types has a corresponding asset-type specific analyzer (col. 8, lines 39-53, Greenfeld).

Regarding claim 14, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. In addition, Zgarba discloses: wherein said asset-type specific analyzer extracts predefined semantic information specific to the asset type to which it corresponds (col. 8, lines 17-28, Greenfeld).

Regarding claims 4 and 15, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 3 and 11, respectively. In addition, Zgarba/Greenfeld didn't disclose: wherein said stored assets comprise code assets and wherein said asset-specific parameters comprise languages in which each code asset is written (page 2, 0026, Zgarba).

Regarding claims 5 and 16, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 4 and 15, respectively. In addition, Zgarba/Greenfeld discloses: wherein said analysis step is performed using language-specific analyzers corresponding to the languages of said code assets (col. 8, lines 54-65, Greenfeld).

Regarding claims 6 and 17, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5 and 16, respectively. In addition, Zgarba/Greenfeld discloses: wherein said language-specific analyzers analyze said stored assets based on predetermined parameters specific to the language to which they correspond (page 2, 0026, Zgarba).

3. *Response to Applicant's Arguments (filed 05/14/04)*

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. *Conclusion*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

McCasland, US 5856931, Method and system for identifying organizing, scheduling, executing, analyzing and documenting detailed inspection activities for specific items in either a time based or on demand fashion.

Kraay et al. U.S 5956717, Database Origami

Agrawal et al. US 6233575, Multilevel taxonomy based on features derived from training documents classification using fisher values as discrimination values.

Gershman et al. US. 6401085, Mobile communication and computing system and method.

Eder (U.S 6321205). Method of and system for modeling and analyzing business improvement programs.

5. Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CN
Cindy Nguyen
November 2, 2004

SM
SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100